



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/534,538	10/31/2005	Yongzhi Xi	272331US0PCT	7166

22850 7590 03/08/2007  
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
1940 DUKE STREET  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
----------

LONG, SCOTT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1633

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/08/2007	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 03/08/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/534,538	XI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Scott D. Long	1633	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement:

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/2005</u>  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Sequence Compliance***

Sequence Listing and CRF have been received and are acknowledged by examiner. A statement that the Computer Readable Form (CRF) and the Sequence Listing are identical has been submitted and is acknowledged by examiner.

### ***Oath/Declaration***

The oath or declaration, having the signatures of all inventors, received on 31 October 2005 is in compliance with 37 CFR 1.63.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The Information Disclosure Statements (IDS) filed on 6 July 2005 consisting of 1 sheet(s) are in compliance with 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, examiner has considered the Information Disclosure Statements.

### ***Priority***

This application claims benefit as a 371 of PCT/CN03/00967 (filed 11/14/2003). This application claims benefit from foreign patent application (CHINA) 02149375.8 (filed 11/14/2002). The instant application has been granted the benefit date, 14 November 2003, from the application PCT/CN03/00967.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 5 objected to because of the following informalities: There is a typo in claim 5, particularly "albe". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 6 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim *cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim*.

Claim 6 depends from claims 3 and 4. Claim 4 depends from claims 1 or 2. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-3, 6-7, and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "CCII" in the second line of the claim. This term is not defined within the claim and is therefore indefinite.

Claims 1-2 are indefinite. Claim 1 recites "SEQ ID NO:1 comprising a polynucleotide sequence encoding full length CCII", while claim 2 recites "a polynucleotide sequence fragment as set forth in SEQ ID NO:2 encoding the full length CCII." SEQ ID NO:1 and 2 are not the same length. It is not clear whether "the full length CCII" is a cDNA, a genomic DNA, or whether it refers to the same sequence. Clarification is requested.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "the CCI" in first line of claim 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 7 provides for the use of CCII, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claims 7 and 11 recite the limitation "RA" in the claims. This term is not defined within either claim and is therefore indefinite.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: "purifying CCII polypeptide". The final step does not seem to purify CCII polypeptide, rather it implies purification of a variety of potential proteins.

The term "a certain amount" in claims 9-10 is a relative term which renders the claims indefinite. The term "a certain amount" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 1633

## WRITTEN DESCRIPTION

Claim 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The methodology for determining adequacy of Written Description to convey that applicant was in possession of the claimed invention includes determining whether the application describes an actual reduction to practice, determining whether the invention is complete as evidenced by drawings or determining whether the invention has been set forth in terms of distinguishing identifying characteristics as evidenced by other descriptions of the invention that are sufficiently detailed to show that applicant was in possession of the claimed invention (*Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications under 35 USC § 112, p 1 "Written Description" Requirement*; (Federal Register/Vol 66, No. 4, Friday, January 5, 2001; II Methodology for Determining Adequacy of Written Description (3.)).

Claims 1-5 are broadly drawn, such that they apply to a genus of nucleic acid sequences which encode fragments of CCII (Chicken Collagen II), having the same biological functions (biological activity). However, the working examples provided in the instant application only includes the cDNA of CCII (SEQ ID NO:2). This genus includes numerous distinct polynucleotides which are not described in the specification. The

Art Unit: 1633

specification also does not include a description of required structures or motifs that provide for the same function as CCII.

The Revised Interim Guideline for Examination of Patent Applications under 35 USC § 112, p1 "Written Description" Requirement (Federal Register/ Vol 66. No 4, Friday January 5, 2001) states "THE CLAIMED INVENTION AS A WHOLE MAY NOT BE ADEQUATELY DESCRIBED IF THE CLAIMS REQUIRE AN ESSENTIAL OR CRITICAL ELEMENT WHICH IS NOT ADEQUATELY DESCRIBED IN THE SPECIFICATION AND WHICH IS NOT CONVENTIONAL IN THE ART" (column 3, page 71434), "WHEN THERE IS SUBSTANTIAL VARIATION WITHIN THE GENUS, ONE MUST DESCRIBE A SUFFICIENT VARIETY OF SPECIES TO REFLECT THE VARIATION WITHIN THE GENUS", "IN AN UNPREDICTABLE ART, ADEQUATE WRITTEN DESCRIPTION OF A GENUS WHICH EMBRACES WIDELY VARIANT SPECIES CANNOT BE ACHIEVED BY DISCLOSING ONLY ONE SPECIES WITHIN THE GENUS" (column 2, page 71436, emphasis added).

*Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 19USPQ2d 1111, clearly states that "APPLICANT MUST CONVEY WITH REASONABLE CLARITY TO THOSE SKILLED IN THE ART THAT, AS OF THE FILING DATE SOUGHT, HE OR SHE WAS IN POSSESSION OF THE INVENTION. THE INVENTION IS, FOR PURPOSES OF THE 'WRITTEN DESCRIPTION' INQUIRY, *WHATEVER IS NOW CLAIMED.*" (See page 1117). The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize the [he or she] invented what is claimed." (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116).

One cannot describe what one has not conceived. See *Fiddes v. Baird*, 30 USPQ2d 1481, 1483. In *Fiddes*, claims directed to mammalian FGF's were found to be unpatentable due to lack of written description for that broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence.

Considering the potentially large numbers of polynucleotides encompassed by these claims, the disclosure is not sufficient to show that a skilled artisan would recognize that the applicant was in possession of the claimed invention (genus) commensurate to its scope at the time the application was filed.

*ENABLEMENT – Gene therapy using Chicken Collagen II gene*

Claims 7-8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required are summarized *In re Wands* 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir, 1988). The Court in *Wands* states: "Enablement is not precluded by the necessity for some 'experimentation.'" Clearly, enablement of a claimed invention cannot be predicated on the basis of quantity of experimentation required to make or use the invention. "Whether undue experimentation is needed is not a single simple factual determination, but rather is a conclusion reached by weighing many factual considerations." (*Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1404). The factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required include: (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount or direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative



Art Unit: 1633

skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims. While all of these factors are considered, a sufficient amount for a prima facie case is discussed below.

In the instant case, claims 7 and 11 are not enabled for a method for treating and/or preventing RA (Rheumatoid Arthritis) using gene therapy with SEQ ID NO:1. Claim 8 is not enabled for a pharmaceutical composition containing therapeutically effective amounts of CCII.

#### *Nature of the Invention*

The nature of the rejected claims of the invention are broadly drawn compositions and methods for treating or preventing Rheumatoid Arthritis (RA) by administration of CCII gene.

#### *Working Examples and Guidance Provided*

The specification does not demonstrate support for any methods of treating RA. Further, there is no support for prevention of RA. No examples are provided that demonstrate the use of Chicken Collagen II gene for treating or preventing Rheumatoid Arthritis. The claim to "inducing a systemic immune response" is therefore considered prophetic.

#### *State of the Art and Analysis of the Issues*

The specification asserts that there is no conclusive evidence in the art that indicates the effectiveness of CCII in treating RA, writing, "to date, these clinical trials are only half-way toward completion" (page 2, parag.2). The specification also indicates that there is "limited knowledge concerning the etiology and pathogenesis of RA" (page 1, parag.2). Therefore there is a level of uncertainty regarding using compositions of CCII for treating RA. The state of the art seems to suggest a high level of uncertainty for using either compositions of protein CCII or nucleic acid compositions of CCII gene for RA therapies.

In particular, the embodiments of the invention being gene therapy, the state of the prior art is not well developed and is highly unpredictable. Verma et al (Nat. 1997 Sep; 389:239-242) states that out of the more than 200 clinical trials currently underway, no single outcome can be pointed to as a success story (page 239, col. 1). For instance, numerous factors complicate the gene therapy art which have not been shown to be overcome by routine experimentation. Eck et al. (Phar Basis Ther 1995; 77-101) explains, the fate of the DNA vector itself (volume of distribution, rate of clearance into the tissues, etc.), the *in vivo* consequences of altered gene expression and protein function, the fraction of vector taken up by the target cell population, the trafficking of the genetic material within cellular organelles, the rate of degradation of the DNA, the level of mRNA produced, the stability of the mRNA produced, the amount and stability of the protein produced, and the protein's compartmentalization within the cell, or its secretory fate, once produced. These factors differ dramatically based on the vector used, the protein being produced, and the disease being treated. (paragraph

Art Unit: 1633

bridging pages 81-82) Verma et al. states that one major obstacle to success has been the inability to deliver genes efficiently and obtain sustained expression (see Verma et al., page 239, col. 3).

Therefore, it is concluded that based upon the nature of the claimed invention, the state of the art, the unpredictability found in the art, the teaching and working examples provided, and the breadth of the claims that it would require undue experimentation to practice the invention.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1633

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Matsumoto et al (US-6,010,722, issued 4 January 2000).

Claims 1-10 are directed to isolated nucleic acids encoding chicken collagen II, fragments thereof, vectors and cells comprising the chicken collagen II gene, recombinant proteins generated therefrom, method of producing recombinant chicken collagen II, compositions of recombinant chicken collagen II, food additives comprising recombinant chicken collagen II. Matsumoto et al. teach, “oral drugs and functional foods [which] contain type-II collagen” (abstract). Matsumoto et al. teach that the type II collagen can be chicken collagen (col.3, line 40). Matsumoto et al. teach that the type-II collagen can be made using “recombinant DNA technology” (col.3, lines 46-47). Inherently, to use recombinant DNA technology for producing type-II chicken collagen, a skilled artisan would need to have cells comprising vectors comprising isolated nucleic acids encoding chicken collagen II. To the extent to which the pharmaceutical composition comprising CCII might have an enabled use (e.g. – a food additive), Matsumoto et al. teach the limitations of claims 7-8. It is noted that Matsumoto et al. also teach the intended use “for treating and preventing rheumatoid arthritis” (col.1, line 6), although it is not certain they are fully enabled for this.

Accordingly, Matsumoto et al. anticipated the instant claims.

***Conclusion***

No claims are allowed.

***Examiner Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Scott Long** whose telephone number is **571-272-9048**.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Joseph Woitach** can be reached on **571-272-0739**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Scott Long  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1633

Janet Epps-Ford  
Primary Examiner  
AU 1633